

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated November 19, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

Claims 36, 39 and 42 were objected to, on the basis of minor informalities. It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing amendments to the claims remove those informalities.

Claims 34-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102, on the basis of the Yap et al. patent (U.S. 6,978,933). For the reasons presented hereinafter, it is respectfully submitted that the Yap patent does not anticipate the subject matter of the rejected claims. However, to advance the prosecution of the application, the claims have been amended to further clarify the distinctions over the Yap patent.

More particularly, claims 34 and 40 recite that the resources of a portable object that are subject to variation, and that are accommodated by the method and device of the present invention, are electric power resources. Support for these recitations can be found in the original specification, for example, at page 6, lines 18-21 and 28-30, and page 7, lines 25-26.

The claims further recite that at least one of the plural communication interfaces is able to provide the portable object with electric power. See, for example, page 21, lines 7-12. In the exemplary embodiments disclosed in the application, both the contact and contactless communication interfaces are able to provide electric power to the portable object.

The Yap patent discloses a smart card that is connected to a remote reader by means of contacts 7, 18. The remote reader communicates with a set-top box 601, by means of a contactless communication interface.

In rejecting the claims, it is not apparent from the Office Action which element, or elements, disclosed in the Yap patent are considered to correspond to the claimed portable object. The rejection refers to the event manager 301. The Yap patent discloses that this process component runs on the computer 100. It does not disclose that it runs on either the smart card 10A or the remote reader 1. If the rejection is not withdrawn, the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify the element in the Yap patent that is interpreted to be the claimed portable object that comprises a processor block and at least two communication interfaces.

In any event, it is respectfully submitted that the Yap patent does not disclose a portable object comprising a processor block and at least two communication interfaces, where at least one of the communication interfaces is able to provide the portable object with electric power. The smart card 10A is only disclosed as having a single communication interface, namely the contacts 18. The remote reader 1 has two communication interfaces, namely the contact 7 and the contactless interface for communicating with the set-top box. However, the Yap patent does not disclose that either of these communication interfaces provide it with electric power. On the contrary, the remote reader is powered by a battery 53. See Figure 10, and column 18, lines 7-10 and 34-36.

For at least these reasons, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Yap patent does not anticipate the subject matter of the presently pending claims, since it fails to disclose each and every feature recited in these claims.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: February 19, 2008

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James A. LaBarre", written over a horizontal line.

James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620